

2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Communication Disorders Review Committee

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 09:39:59 AM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2018

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Communication Disorders Review Committee

3b. GSA Committee No.

834

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

06/01/1986

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 USC 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 3 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 3

Purpose

NIH Peer Review

Start

10/19/2017

End

- 10/19/2017

NIH Peer Review

02/08/2018

- 02/09/2018

NIH Peer Review

06/14/2018

- 06/15/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 3

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$272,437.00	\$265,741.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$56,718.00	\$57,682.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$66,575.00	\$67,906.00

18d. Total	\$425,730.00	\$421,329.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	1.90	1.90

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications . . . , and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications in the fields of hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech and language. During the reporting period the committee reviewed 157 applications requesting \$63,251,941 direct costs and recommended 157 applications .

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the fields of academic medicine, basic research and clinical sciences related to the seven mission areas of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD). The members provide primary scientific review of specialized grant mechanisms supported by the NIDCD.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Communication Disorders Review Committee held three meetings during this reporting period.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This Committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the Communication Disorders Review Committee were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could

reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy.

21. Remarks

Reports: The committee did not produce any public reports during this fiscal year. Zip

Codes: Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

Designated Federal Officer

MELISSA J. STICK CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BRANCH

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
AGRAWAL, YURI	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DIVISION OF OTOTOLOGY, NEUROTOLOGY AND SKULL BASE SURGERY	Peer Review Consultant Member
AMREIN, HUBERT	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE HEAD	Peer Review Consultant Member
ANDERSON, JULIE	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BALABAN, CAREY	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BRADY, NANCY	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BROWN, CAROLYN	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CAMARATA, STEPHEN	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CAMPAGNARI, ANTHONY	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHATTERJEE, MONITA	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHENG, ALAN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CRAMER, KARINA	07/01/2017	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DHAR, SUMITRAJIT	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member

FABIANO-SMITH, LEAH	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
FONTANINI, ALFREDO	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
FROEMKE, ROBERT	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GERRATT, BRUCE	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GIFFORD, RENE	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GILLAM, RONALD	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	RAYMOND AND ELOISE LILLYWHITE ENDOWED CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOFFMAN, LISA	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	PROFESSOR AND NELLE C. JOHNSTON CHAIR IN EARLY CHILDHOOD COMMUNICATION DISORDERS	Peer Review Consultant Member
GRACCO, VINCENT	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	VICE PRESIDENT OF SCIENTIFIC OPERATIONS, SENIOR SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
GRAY, SHELLEY	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GROSH, KARL	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GROSSMAN, RUTH	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HALUM, STACEY	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	RESEARCH PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAMMER, MICHAEL	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR; DIRECTOR, AIRWAY SENSORY PHYSIOLOGY LABORATORY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HASTINGS, MICHELLE	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HE, DAVID	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HILLIS, ARGYE	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	PROFESSOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
JIA, XINQIAO	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KANDLER, KARL	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KERBER, KEVIN	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

KIRAN, SWATHI	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	RESEARCH DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KUJAWA, SHARON	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KURLAND, JACQUIE, PHD, CCC-SLP	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KURUVILLA-DUGDALE, MILI	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LAUER, AMANDA	07/01/2018	05/30/2022	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LEMON, CHRISTIAN	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LIEBENTHAL, EINAT	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	LECTURER	Peer Review Consultant Member
LONG, JENNIFER	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LOVE-GEFFEN, TRACY	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lang, MD, PHD, Hainan	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MAYBERRY, RACHEL	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCCREERY, RYAN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCGANN, JOHN	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MESGARANI, NIMA	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MONGEAU, LUC	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
NAIGLES, LETITIA	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
NARAYANAN, SHRIKANTH	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
NEWLANDS, SHAWN	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
OGHALAI, JOHN	07/01/2014	06/30/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

OSTERHOUT, LEE	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PARRISH, TODD	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PENA, JOSE	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
POLLEY, DANIEL	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RIAZUDDIN, SAIMA	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RIEHLE, MICHAEL	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SAPIENZA, CHRISTINE	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES, PROGRAM DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHNUR, TATIANA	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHRIVASTAV, RAHUL	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	VICE PRESIDENT FOR INSTRUCTION	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHUSTER, LINDA	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SPENCER, JULIET	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STEELE, CATRIONA	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	SENIOR SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
STEPP, CARA	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
TAGER-FLUSBERG, HELEN	02/08/2018	02/09/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
TREMBLAY, KELLY	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
VAN HORNE, AMANDA	10/19/2017	10/19/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WHEELER, DAVID	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WISE, PAUL	06/14/2018	06/15/2018	ASSOCIATE MEMBER	Peer Review Consultant Member
YUNUSOVA, YANA	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 69

Narrative Description

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications . . . , and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications in the fields of hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech and language. During the reporting period the committee reviewed 157 applications requesting \$63,251,941 direct costs. The Committee provides advice to the Director, NIDCD on programs and activities in the areas of communication science. The committee reviews grant applications, National Research Service Award training grants, conference grants, Career Development Awards, fellowships, and special projects in the communication and chemosensory sciences. To accomplish its mission, the committee, which is composed of members who are identified from academic medicine, basic research and the clinical sciences related to the mission of the NIDCD and invited to serve for overlapping terms of four years, meets and reviews grant applications three times a year. The committee is an essential component of the Institute and continues to provide important information to the Director, NIDCD.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

NIH-supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

2,598

Number of Recommendations Comments

2598 is the number of grants reviewed from 2003-2018.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Meeting minutes, oral presentations, and written reports.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of approved or recommended for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These included alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After

all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 157

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 157

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$63,251,941

Grant Review Comments

The dollar amount recommended is for grant applicant's direct costs.

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO ☒

Online Agency Web Site ☒

Online Committee Web Site ☒

Online GSA FACA Web Site ☒

Publications ☐

Other ☐

Access Comments

N/A